

Applicant: Jeffrey P. Milsap  
Application No.: 10/024,159  
Response to Office action dated July 27, 2006  
Response filed August 3, 2006

### **Remarks**

Claims 4 and 6–23 remain pending in the application. Claims 1–3 and 5 have been canceled. In the Office action dated Jul. 27, 2006, claims 8–23 were allowed and claims 4 and 6–7 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any proceeding claims.

Claims 4 and 6–7 have been rewritten in independent form, and claims 9 and 14 have been amended to remove a minor typographical error. Paragraph [0050] has been amended to correct a typographical error replacing a period with a comma in the last line.

Claims 7, 9, 14 and 16 have been amended to remove extraneous articles. Claims 6, 13, 18 and 20 have been amended to remove extraneous commas. Claim 21 has been amended to correctly state that the second pointer array has a pointer “corresponding” to each of the speakers in the array. Claim 12 has been amended to provide a terminal period. Claim 16 has been amended to correctly refer to plural ceiling panels.

Claim 14 has been amended properly refer to a second sound amplitude which is “at least 20 dB less than” the first sound amplitude, and to improve definiteness by referring to “the region of localized sound having the first sound amplitude.”

Claim 8 has been amended to refer to the speakers with a uniform terminology, and to clarify the relationship of the time delay of the transmission of the second audio source to the distance between the speakers and the second sound target.

Claim 19 has been amended to provide clarifying language in the first element, to uniformly refer to the “third amplitude” and to correct typographical errors in the last element to properly refer to the “second region of localized sound”.

Claim 14 has been amended to definitely refer to “a substantially identical sound wave” and then to refer to “each substantially identical sound wave”.

To complete the written record of the prosecution of this application, it is noted that on

Applicant: Jeffrey P. Milsap  
Application No.: 10/024,159  
Response to Office action dated July 27, 2006  
Response filed August 3, 2006

May 5, 2006, applicant's representative contacted the examiner by phone and requested reconsideration of the Final Rejection mailed on Apr. 19, 2006, requesting that the examiner consult his SPE. The examiner responded by phone on May 9, 2006, and indicated that the Final Rejection mailed on Apr. 19, 2006, would be withdrawn in the new action (mailed Jul. 27, 2006).

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934  
Attorney for Applicant  
Stiennon & Stiennon  
P.O. Box 1667  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667  
(608) 250-4870  
Amdt2.res

August 3, 2006 (2:11pm)